

Remark/Arguments

A. Claims in the Case

Claims 7, 23, 49, 93, and 116 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 13, 22, 24, 43, 48, 54, 64, 81, 88, 95, 114, 115, and 117 have been amended. Claims 118-122 are new. Claims 1-6, 8-20, 22, 24-28, 43-48, 51-60, 62-68, 81-92, 94-99, 114, 115, 117-122 are pending in the case.

B. The Claims Are Not Obvious Over Ryan in View of Brooks, Borghesi, and Vaidyanathan Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20, 22-28, 43-49, 51-60, 62-28, 81-99, and 111-113 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,655,085 to Ryan et al. (hereinafter, "Ryan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,992,972 to Brooks et al. (hereinafter "Brooks") and U.S. Patent No. 5,950,169 to Borghesi et al. (hereinafter "Borghesi") and of U.S. Patent No. 6,467,081 to Vaidyanathan et al. (hereinafter "Vaidyanathan") under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

To reject a claim as obvious, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Warner*, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173, 177-78 (C.C.P.A. 1967). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974); MPEP § 2143.03. In addition, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 1, 13, 24, 43, 54, 64, 81, 88, and 95 have been amended to describe combinations of features including: "wherein the first unit of help information for the first step comprises

context sensitive help for the first step, wherein the context sensitive help for the first step is automatically invoked and displayed on the display when the first step is initiated, wherein the first step is displayed on one portion of the display and the first unit of help information is displayed on another portion of the display”. Support for the amendments may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 5, lines 2-3; page 16, lines 11-13, 19-28; FIG. 8, page 37, lines 13-22. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted features of claims 1, 13, 24, 43, 54, 64, 81, 88, and 95 in combination with the other features of the claims.

Vaidyanathan discloses invoking an automatic help module when a predetermined event occurs “when a user enters a particular token or type of token”. (Vaidyanathan, column 7, lines 34-36). Vaidyanathan gives as examples of tokens: identifier names, function name, class names, macro names, global and local variable names, and operators. Vaidyanathan, either alone or in combination with the other cited art, does not appear to teach or suggest context sensitive help information for the first step that is automatically invoked and displayed on the display when the first step is initiated, wherein the first step is displayed on one portion of the display and the first unit of help information is displayed on another portion of the display. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections of claim 1, 13, 24, 43, 54, 64, 81, 88, and 95 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant submits that many of the claims dependent on claims 1, 13, 24, 43, 54, 64, 81, 88, and 95 are separately patentable. For example, claim 6 has been amended to describe a combination of features including:

- wherein the one or more help information tables comprise:
 - a header table, wherein units of help information in the header table include headers from one or more documents related to the processing of the bodily injury insurance claim; and
 - a text table, wherein units of help information in the text table include text sections from the one or more documents;
- the method further comprising:

determining a first relevance value for the first unit of help information read from the first help information entry for the first step; and
determining a second relevance value for the second unit of help information read from the second help information entry for the first step;
wherein the first unit of help information and the second unit of help information are displayed in order of their relevance values, and
wherein, in determining at least one of the first or second relevance values, a header relevance value is adjusted such that occurrences in the headers are more relevant than occurrences in the text sections.

The cited art, whether considered separately or in combination, does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted features of claim 6, in combination with the other features of the claim.

C. The Claims Are Not Obvious Over Ryan in View of Brooks, Borghesi, and Vaidyanathan in View of Kaufman Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 114-115 and 117 as being obvious over Ryan in view of Brooks, Borghesi and Vaidyanathan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,408 to Kaufman et al. (hereinafter "Kaufman") under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

Claim 114, 115, and 117 have been amended to recite: wherein the first and second units of help information comprise headers from one or more documents related to the processing of the bodily injury insurance claim and text sections from the one or more documents" and "wherein, in determining at least one of the first and second relevance values, a header relevance value is adjusted such that occurrences in the headers are more relevant than occurrences in the text sections." Support for the amendments may be found in Applicant's specification at least on page 29, lines 22-26; page 30, lines 19-28; and page 32, lines 10-22. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted features of claims 114, 115, or 117, in combination with the other features of the claims.

Kaufman discloses assessing relevance of documents based on distribution, or clusering of query words in the candidate document (Kaufman, column 2, lines 30-66). The method may include assigning a quantity to sentences in the document that depends on how far into a document the occurrences of query words are (see, e.g., Kaufman, column 10, lines 34-45). Kaufman, whether considered separately or in combination with the other cited art does not appear to teach or suggest units of help information comprising headers from one or more documents related to the processing of the bodily injury insurance claim and text sections from the one or more documents, in which, to determine relevance values, a header relevance value is adjusted such that occurrences in the headers are more relevant than occurrences in the text sections. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections of claim 114 and 115 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

D. New Claims

New claim 118 describes a combination of features including “wherein the first and second relevance values comprise relevance values for occurrences headers and relevance values for text sections, wherein the weight or scaling factors for the first and second relevance values are such that the relevance values for the headers are always at least as high as the relevance values for the text sections.” Support for claim 118 may be found in the specification at least on page 25, lines 20-27. Applicant submits that the combination of features of this claim are not taught or suggested by the cited art.

New claim 119 describes a combination of features including “wherein the first and second relevance values comprise relevance values for occurrences headers and relevance values for text sections, wherein the weight or scaling factors for the first and second relevance values are such that the minimum relevance values for the headers are the maximum relevance values for the text sections.” Support for claim 119 may be found in the specification at least on page

25, lines 20-24. Applicant submits that the combination of features of this claim are not taught or suggested by the cited art.

New claim 120 describes a combination of features including “displaying on the display a location of an occurrence of the first unit of help information in one or more documents.” Support for claim 120 may be found in the specification at least on page 36, line 28 to page 37, line 11; page 37, lines 20-21; and FIG. 8. Applicant submits that the combination of features of this claim are not taught or suggested by the cited art.

New claim 121 describes a combination of features including “displaying on the display a location of an occurrence of the first unit of help information in one or more documents, wherein the location is displayed as a chapter hierarchy of at least one of the documents in which the occurrence is found.” Support for claim 121 may be found in the specification at least on page 36, line 28 to page 37, line 11; page 37, lines 20-22; and FIG. 8. Applicant submits that the combination of features of this claim are not taught or suggested by the cited art.


New claim 122 describes a combination of features including “wherein one portion of the display comprises a plurality of step elements, wherein another portion of the display comprises context sensitive help for the step and context sensitive help for each of the step elements.” Support for claim 122 may be found in the specification at least on page 37, lines 5-22 and FIG. 8. Applicant submits that the combination of features of this claim are not taught or suggested by the cited art.

E. Additional Remarks

Based on the above, Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5053-35700/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric B. Meyertons
Reg. No. 34,876

Attorney for Applicant (s)

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: 12-20-05